1	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCSBN 9990) United States Attorney
2 3	MARK L. KROTOSKI (CASBN 138549) Chief, Criminal Division
4 5 6 7 8	BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY (CASBN 241350) Assistant United States Attorney 150 Almaden Boulevard San Jose, California 95113 Telephone: (408) 535-5059 Facsimile: (408) 535-5066 Email: benjamin.t.kennedy@usdoj.gov
9	Attorneys for the United States of America
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION *E-FILED - 6/27/07*
13	
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) No. CR 07-00340 RMW
15	Plaintiff, STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM JUNE
16	v.) 11, 2007 TO JULY 9, 2007 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT CALCULATION
17	DANIEL VICTORIA-BENTANCOURT,) (18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)) a/k/a, DANIEL BENTANCOURT,)
18	Defendant.
19 20	On June 11, 2007 the parties appeared for a hearing before this Court. At that hearing,
21	defense counsel requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act based upon defense
22	counsel's need to effectively prepare by reviewing the defendant's A file and other discovery
23	materials submitted by the government. At that time, the Court set the matter for a hearing on
24	July 9, 2007.
25	The parties stipulate that the time between June 11, 2007 and July 9, 2007 is excluded
26	under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested

continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective

preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the

27

28

Document 10

Case 5:07-cr-00340-RMW

Filed 06/27/2007

Page 2 of 3

ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between June 11, 2007 and July 9, 2007 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. §3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 6/27/07

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE